

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

JOHN BURTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF SPOKANE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

NO. CV-06-322-RHW

**ORDER DENYING MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION**

On March 4, 2011, the Court entered an Order Denying Motion to Vacate Judgment/Order (ECF No. 264). On March 14, 2011, Plaintiff filed a Reply to Defendant's Response and Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 265).

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and are only appropriate if the Court is presented with newly discovered evidence; has committed clear error, or there is an intervening change in the controlling law. *389 Orange Street Partners v. Arnold*, 179 F.3d 656, 665 (9th Cir. 1999). To succeed in a motion for reconsideration, a party must set forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to induce the Court to reverse its prior decision. *See Kern-Tulare Water Dist. v. City of Bakersfield*, 634 F. Supp. 656, 665 (E.D. Cal. 1986), *aff'd in part and rev'd in part on other grounds*, 828 F.2d 514 (9th Cir. 1987).

Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that the Court should reconsider its Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Vacate.

///

///

1 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

2 1. Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 265) is **DENIED.**

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The District Court Executive is directed to enter this
4 Order, forward copies to counsel, and **close the file.**

5 **DATED** this 1st day of April, 2011.

6
7 *s/Robert H. Whaley*

8 ROBERT H. WHALEY
9 United States District Judge

10 Q:\CIVIL\2006\Burton\recons.wpd